Future Contingents in Arguments of Political Censorship: Modal Propositions in Contrast. Solorzano Pereira Stands up to the Censors of *De Indiarum Iure* (1638)

Gonzalo Tinajeros Arce

I. Introduction

Juan de Solorzano Pereira (1575–1655) was an original thinker of the Ibero-American Baroque period who lived for two decades in the Spanish West Indies (Peru and Bolivia). He had to do a real juggling between the Spanish economic interests and the Indigenous cultural values in a scenario of deep conflicting relations. It occurred precisely amidst the emergence of a political proposal to establish a mix republic for Spaniards and Indigenous people into a new world.

Solorzano's intellectual position was very strong and difficult: on the one hand he represented the crown interests in the West Indies territories and acted as a good and remarkable royal officer (conciliator of Charcas and counsellor of the Indies) with strong attitudes of discipline, moral duties, and efficient activities. On the other hand, he manifested his political and philosophical perception that consisted in the fact that the Spanish government should abolish the extreme abuses against lives and minds of the native indigenous people. Various kinds of forced labor should be prohibited in the Indian Law, because it had been enslaving the indigenous people's lives. Nevertheless, Solorzano wrote sometimes about the necessity to keep the public utility labors in favor to the Spanish empire, but only if a just price was to be guaranteed to the indigenous workers. Solorzano's tried to find a midpoint in relation to Spanish and indigenous interests according to the use of subtle probabilistic reasonings.

Turnhout, 2025 (Rencontres de Philosophie Médiévale 31) *pp. 233-246*
© BREPOLS PUBLISHERS NV
DOI 10.1484/M.RPM-EB.5.153871
This is an open access chapter made available under a CC BY-NC-ND 4.0 International License.

The political censorship of the second volume of *De Indiarum Iure* lamentably reveals structural problems facing the freedom speech in the public health (*salutis publicae*) of the Spanish colonial empire. The eighteenth and nineteen centuries will be revolutionary times, especially to the freedom demands on behalf of the indigenous people. They did not want to stay indefinitely neither as temporary servants nor as second-class vassals in the West Indies.

II. First intellectual effort to reduce the slavery temporality towards freedom[1] through the probabilism of contrary opinion

Juan de Solorzano Pereira presented himself as an innovative writer, critical towards the traditional and conservative visions about slavery during his ages, which, supported by the *Ius Gentium*, took as a universal principle the necessity of unconditional slavery of war prisoners. Analyzing through his experiences in the West Indies, Solorzano observed as highly rigid the perpetual enslavement of the indigenous people, once this could only lead to extreme poverty, suffering, political intrigues, unmeasurable violence, and eternal heartbreak to the Christian consciences. He thinks that Christian humanism shall be the safe pathway to the gradual freedom of the indigenous people, and that it can be easily taught to those human beings with docility, tranquility, patience and good mood with the indigenous people – so that they may voluntarily convert to Christianism in order to civilize themselves in a state of peace and delimit them a short temporality in the undesired state of slavery, so that they enter the soonest the paths of freedom as equal and free vassals in a new mixed republic in the West Indies.

The imprisonment of the natives and the violent imposition of slavery, grounded on the customs of *Ius Gentium*, were outcomes of these armed conflicts. The decision to keep the indigenous people as captives was taken during the colonial period and subjected to a scale of

[1] For detailed information about the modalities of serfdom and modalities of freedom in the Solorzano's thought, see the article G. Tinajeros, "Indian Law: Modalities of Freedom and Modalities of Serfdom to the Indigenous People in Charcas-Bolivia. Inquire into Juan de Solorzano Pereira's Philosophical and Political arguments", in *Slavery, Freedom, and Beyond: Interdisciplinary Debates on Brazilian and African Societies in Historical and Contemporary perspective,* ed. R. H. Pich, S. Conermann (Dependency and Slavery Studies), Berlin-New York forthcoming.

temporality or transience in future contingencies for the sanction and especially the releasing of natives due to the jurisdictional influence of the conciliator from Charcas:

> Pero en ese caso no son esclavos con esclavitud perpetua, sino con servidumbre temporal que ha de durar tanto cuanto, en compensación del precio recibido, les parezca suficiente a los jueces que conocen estos casos.[2]

Solorzano Pereira centers his main juridical-philosophical argument on the temporal condition of slavery via probabilism. He believed in a mere probable opinion, yet solid, which departs from his innovative notion of contrary opinion. After rigorous hearings and analyses of other contemporary opinions about the nature of slavery, Solorzano decided to assume a risky standpoint in *De Indiarum Iure*. Whereas most opinions of doctors from his time were based on the value of the positive law and the most probable opinion, Solorzano based his on the natural law. Solorzano chose one of the less probable opinions ever; in this matter, the positive law related closely to the usual principles of *Ius Gentium*. Solorzano Pereira claimed that an open and acute evaluation of the condition of slavery was necessary to reach a *secura conscientia* status based on a solid decision about such an important and controversial topic. For this reason, he contrasted the relevance of expressing a contrary opinion[3] against the opinion considered the most probable one. The contrary opinion should be carefully elaborated and closer to the profound truth for its basis on the imprescriptible principles of the natural freedom of indigenous people, regarded as men or human beings. According to these principles, after a just war, indigenous people would be allowed to gradually return to a fairer state of freedom and peace in scenarios of future contingencies, necessarily following the natural law for that. It would be up to indigenous people to decide about purely voluntary conversion to Christianity, the accomplishment of agreement and peace activities, the civilization of uncivil enslaved people, and becoming vassals in some future contingency of a mixed republic led by the Spanish Crown.

Natives were publicly and privately forced into compulsory labor in the 17th century. This situation shows how indigenous vassals' autonomy was very restricted as they had to obey the orders from Spanish

---

[2] J. Solórzano, *De Indiarum Iure* (Colección Corpus Hispanorum de Pace), Madrid 1994, III, 463.

[3] Solórzano, *De Indiarum Iure*, III, 412-463.

workers and, not so often, from the only free natives, *Caciques* and *Curacas* that worked as inspectors (*Corregidores)* in some provinces of the West Indies.

Local governors defended public utility, arguing that it met the royal orders and enormously benefited the public treasury of the monarchy. Furthermore, they claimed that indigenous people had voluntarily traded the workforce for money to survive. Apart from forced labor, Spaniards and criollos forced indigenous people to take private jobs called *Yanaconazgo* in Spaniards' houses and farms. This fact withdrew indigenous people's moral dignity and health since these occupations turned them into servants of abusive householders.

Solorzano wrote a direct reflection against kinds of labor *Yanaconazgo and Mita,* showing the abuses the Spaniards and American criollos practiced against indigenous people. That is why the chancellors of the Spanish Crown Jose de Napoles and Francisco de Alarcon censored[4] in 1638 a part of his book. He was compelled to prohibit the most controversial pieces of the text in which he wrote about public and private forced labor in colonial territories, especially in Charcas, Potosí, and Lima.

The second volume of *De Indiarum Iure* was censored and first appeared in the *Index Librorum Prohibitorum*. In 1638, the Crown's counsellors and regents Jose de Napoles and Francisco de Alarcon issued two opinions arguing for the book's condemnation, unless Solorzano removed some parts and changed others. These parts contained opinions accusing Spanish residents in the West Indies of ill-treatment of the indigenous people in the new world and holding them as miserable servants.

In a Royal command dated from September 28th, 1637, Philip IV, king of Spain, ordered the secretary of the West Indies Council, Royal advisers Fernando Ruiz de Contreras and Francisco Contreras to ban the publishing of all the pages of Juan de Solorzano Pereira's *Indiarum Iure*. Warning that the work could become future ammunition in the hands of the enemies of the Spanish Crown in the conquest of America, the king also ordered its immediate revision by two censors. Curiously

[4] See Luciano's Pereña study preliminary to the Spanish edition of *De Indiarum Iure*, especially *Solórzano, Defensor oficial de la Corona,* in SOLÓRZANO, *De Indiarum Iure,* III, 19-61.

enough, on July 16th, 1636, the publication of the very same manuscript had been authorized by the Real Council of the West Indies after Lorenzo Ramirez de Prado's favourable review. Prado was a specialist in the West Indies.

According to a royal order dated from November 2nd, 1637, the king of Spain signed a mandate to Lic. Jose de Napoles asking for an analysis of the 17th chapter of Solorzano's manuscript. The king determined that Napoles should inform the author of any critical part that was not in accordance with the censor guidelines and ruled that the critical free speech regarding the actions of Spaniards against the native indigenous people in the new world had to be restricted. After Napoles censoring of the manuscript, the Majesty Philip IV asked the royal adviser Francisco de Alarcon, on March 12th, 1638, to elaborate an ultimate review censoring political and juridical contents of the second volume of *De Indiarum Iure*. The royal command and censors claimed urgent remedies, moderation, and soft language, omitting any kind of abuses, violence, or crimes, suffered by indigenous people in labor activities in the mines, farmers, and works of public utilities.

Both reviews were sent to the State Council on June 29th, 1638, and after a long deliberation, the assembly resolved that Solorzano's manuscript should not be printed and, let alone, published because the inconvenient effects of the critical book were very possible in undetermined future contingencies. Count Castrillo commanded on June 2nd, 1638, that only the pages with specific corrections by the censors should be sent to Solorzano for rewriting the final version of the second volume before its publishing.

One encounters three types of future in all these documents dating from the 17th century.

1. Immediate future in royal imperative to a concise analysis of the manuscript.

Modal Propositions in the first type of future:

a) King Philip IV of Spain decides on September 28th, 1637, that the unrestricted circulation of the yet to be published book by Juan Solorzano, which had been authorized by the counselor of the Indies Lorenzo Ramirez, must be revisited as soon as possible, but that the manuscript in the immediate future could certainly become ideological ammunition for the political enemies of the Spanish nation.

(b) On November 2nd, 1637, King Philip IV orders his advisor, Jose de Napoles, that he will have to analyze very carefully the 17 chapters of Solorzano's manuscript and he should inform the author of any critical part that was not in accordance with the censor guidelines so that the critical parts against the Spanish would be removed or eliminated as soon as possible with the respective corrections to the book that is yet to be published.

(c) Francisco de Alarcon should elaborate a detailed opinion on any excesses in the critical tone of Juan de Solorzano's manuscript and then would have to send it for final review to King Philip IV in accordance with the royal command of March 12th, 1638.

2. Open future for outlining possible critical parts that could imply in a contingent future low moral dignity to the Spanish crown. It was used when Solorzano would denounce extreme abuses, slavery, and deaths of indigenous people with the intent to alter those abusive situations in another contingent future.

Modal Propositions in contrast in the second type of open future:

(a) Solorzano expresses in the censored manuscript that the private works (i.e. Yanaconazgo, Obrajes) in the houses of the Spaniards and Creoles, carried out by the indigenous people, neither gave dignity nor helped with the necessary economic subsistence for the indigenous people. On the contrary, those works and in those hard conditions should be finished and in an open, contingent and probable future, those extreme abuses should be suspended and could no longer obliterate the life of the indigenous people.

(b) The *contrary opinion or negative opinion*, says Solorzano, should be carefully elaborated, well founded by reason and justice, even if it must oppose the customs and the enforced law in each epoch. The natives discovered in the new world are by nature human beings, and they will be able to recover their freedom, once the just war imposed by the Spaniards is over. The indigenous natives should through natural law be able to generate with their conduct gradual, legitimate and legal scenarios of peace in future contingencies in which they could become vassals on behalf of a mixed republic of Spanish and indigenous people led by the Spanish Crown.

(c) The Spanish government should abolish the extreme abuses against lives and minds of the native indigenous people. Nevertheless,

Solorzano wrote sometimes about the necessity to keep the public utility labors, but only in the case a just price was to be guaranteed to the indigenous workers.

(d) Solorzano believes that Christian humanism shall epitomize the safe pathway to the gradual freedom of the indigenous people, and that it can be easily taught to those human beings with docility, tranquility, patience and good mood – so that they might voluntarily convert to Christianism.

3. Open contingent future from the perspective of the censors in relation to problems and inconveniences caused by the publication of manuscripts with critical content that would end up producing adverse effects in possible but not yet confirmed worlds.[5]

Modal Propositions in contrast in the third type of open future:

(a) The reviews disclosed by both censors are based on hypothetical situations of possible worlds in uncertain but quite realizable futures. The publication would cause intellectual enemies of the Kingdom of Spain to use the harsh arguments of Charcas and Lima conciliator to undermine the legitimacy of the Right of Retention of the West Indies, and for this reason the manuscript should be censored until it could be corrected and softened.

(b) In 1638, the Crown's counsellors and regents Jose de Napoles and Francisco de Alarcon shared two severe opinions arguing for the book's condemnation, unless Solorzano removed some parts and changed necessarily others. These parts contained opinions accusing the Spanish residents in the West Indies of ill-treatment of the indigenous people in the new world and keeping them as miserable servants.

III. Review of Jose de Napoles

On March 12th, 1638, Jose de Napoles, regent and counsellor of the Crown, wrote a review objecting the publication of Solorzano's manu-

[5] Regarding the logical possibilities of determining possible individuals in possible worlds, see, D. K. Lewis, *Sobre la pluralidad de mundos*, Mexico 2015, 103-244. Also see the external logical analysis of possible worlds, A. Barceló, *Sobre el análisis,* Mexico 2019, 127-213.

script. Napoles argued for the necessity of censoring some chapters, especially those that included insinuations of brutal repression, unjustified violence against Natives working in mines, coca plantations, houses and public utility services. Napoles based his objections on possible future contingencies that could affect the honor of the Spanish nation. Such hypotheses pointing to a probable negative future operated as a strategy to derail the possibility that Solorzano's experiences could reinforce any critical narrative about the Indies. Napoles would not support any work that contradicted the mainstream discourse and the principles of the raison d'état. Censors accused Solorzano of being imprudent. Thus, it was imperative to censor his work in order to remedy the situation, erasing parts of the manuscript that could harm the dignity of Spain.

In this probable world, Napoles disagreed with Solorzano's rational argument that criticism of abuses by the Spanish could produce some consciousness about the situation and, thus in the future, improve the treatment of indigenous vassals. For Napoles, the unrestricted publication of the complete manuscript could boost uprisings against the province's governments, downgrade Spaniards' human values and work as ammunition for the enemies of the Empire.

Finally, Napoles emphasized that those who occupied inferior positions in the political administrative structure had no right to question royal orders or put them in doubt, let alone accusations of irrational injustice in the positive laws and costumes. Napoles' strong argument was centered on legality, for everybody had to respect the positive law of the state and could not contradict its mandates. The obligation to obey royal laws and to execute magistrate dispositions should prevail.

Censors' recommendations to Solorzano: the writer should soften his words, especially when giving his opinions. He should be careful with expressions chosen to write about brutal labor abuses against Natives. The author should omit dubious sentences in relation to facts and withdraw all quotes from enemies of the Spanish Empire. Napoles clearly expressed that Solorzano's contrary opinions to the Spanish Crown, specifically those related to the brutal governmental treatment of Indigenous people, should be left out. The same should be done with Solorzano's opinions on Yanaconazgo: the regulation of indigenous services held in private/domestic spaces. Solorzano argued that these services were a heavy mode of serfdom that condemned indigenous

people to work to death. His opinions on different kinds of forced labor in plantations, cities, and silver mines should also be censored.

Parts that should be left out from the text: (cap 2., n.17, p. 10.); (cap.3, n. 40, p.16); (cap.13, n.14, p102); (cap. 16, n. 81, p.140); (cap 17, n.17, p.150).[6]

Alarcon, the second censor, is less severe with Solorzano's manuscript. He demands a few corrections and some omissions. More importantly, he asks for remediation and softening of expressions that point to abuses by the Spaniards against Indigenous people working in mines.

The author should suppress the toughness of his words when mentioning *servitii immanitate*. In chapter 15, Solorzano chooses negative or contrary opinion, which condemns the costumes of Laboral services in the colonies, defining them as unjust.

IV. Solorzano's position and strategy to limit the censures: A few philosophical reflections about the political censorship in the document 17 (Archive general of Simancas, E. 2660, March 12 of 1638)

Indigenous people performed modalities of voluntary and involuntary serfdom intrinsic to different kinds of forced labor in plantations, fields, cities, and silver mines. The workforce was usually traded for small amounts of money and food, never enough to live with dignity. For Solorzano, these illustrate the material, moral, and socially miserable conditions to which indigenous people were subjected. Yet, paradoxically, there were laws[7] and even money bills[8] of Carlos V, Felipe II,

---

[6] See Luciano's Pereña boards of censure in the study preliminary to the Spanish edition of *De Indiarum Iure*, especially *Solórzano, Defensor oficial de la Corona*. In: Solórzano, *De Indiarum Iure,* III, 41-44.

[7] New laws from 1542 explicitly prohibited enslavement. See the Indies' compiled laws of the Spanish Crown, vol. 2, 1681. Available at http://www.memoriachilena.gob.cl/archivos2/pdfs/MC0018802.pdf

[8] In *De Indiarum Iure*, Solorzano Pereira highlights the royal bills from May 27th, 1582, December 5th, 1608, and December 31st, 1608, in which Spaniards reprimand the vice-king Marques de Montesclaros and the Lima's Archbishop for the ill-treatment and carelessness of indigenous people. Solorzano argued that the new vassals of the Crown should be treated with moderation and subtlety to be guided to Christianity through praying and Catholic instruction, Solórzano, *De Indiarum Iure,* III, 386-389.

Felipe III, and Felipe IV, in which indigenous people were defined as free men, vassals of the Spanish Kingdom who should be taken care of and treated with subtlety to lead them to Christianity smartly:

> Y porque habiéndose tan cumplidamente lo que ha parecido convenir al bien espiritual y temporal y conversión de los dichos indios, teniendo tanto cuidado de procurar que fuesen doctrinados e instruidos en las cosas de nuestra santa fe católica mantenidos en justicia y amparados en su libertad como súbditos y vasallos nuestros, entendíamos que nuestros ministros cumplían lo que les habíamos ordenado. Y de no haberlo hecho ni cumplido y llegando a estado de tanta miseria y trabajos, nos ha dolido, como es razón. Y fuera justo que vos y vuestros antecesores, como buenos y cuidadosos pastores, hubiérades mirado por vuestras ovejas, solicitando el cumplimiento de lo que en su favor está proveído o dándonos aviso de los excesos que hubiese, para que mandásemos a remediar, y se cumpliese nuestra voluntad, que es de que estos pobres gocen de descanso y quietud y conozcan a nuestro Señor, para que mediante su divina gracia y la predicación del santo evangelio puedan salvarse, etc.[9]

Solorzano used religious metalanguage to express his saddest and desolate feelings and thoughts about the abuses he observed *in loco*. He witnessed the pain of working indigenous people in the colonial cities of Potosí, Charcas, Lima, and Cuzco. Solorzano used his metaphysical sagacity[10] to stop the second volume of *Indiarum Iure* from being censored, using Jewish representations and symbols. First, he portrayed the sufferings of Jewish enslaved people in Ancient Egypt. Then he compared the Semite misery to the painful abuses daily inflicted on indigenous people in their lands in America (*Abya Ayala*). Through this strategy, Solorzano found it possible to denounce the strong asymmetries in domination and serfdom in the social relations of the mixed republic of Spanish masters and indigenous servants. Thus, through the Jewish religious modality, divine and metaphysical words comfort the souls in colonial America and allow them to recognize the asymmetries of their own lives. There were two republican entities in the

[9] King Felipe's bill, given in Lisbon on May 27th, 1582, sent to the of Lima for publishing. Solórzano, *De Indiarum Iure,* III, 386-387. Italics from the original.

[10] In relation of the metaphysical sagacity and creativity in the speculative thinking of Solorzano, see the article: G. Tinajeros "Opiniones probables sobre el origen de los indios occidentales. Un estudio sobre la inteligencia imaginativa en el *De Indiarum Iure,* de J. Solórzano Pereira", in *Revista Classica Boliviana*, 12 (2023), 341-362. Available at https://ojs.umsa.bo/ojs/index.php/classica/article/view/161/545

Indies divided by privileges and the kind of domination. Yet, they were constituted as one mixed society (the mixed republic) that, in some contingent future, would adapt to the natural law and have to merge to produce uniform vassals with equal rights in the same empire:

> 11-14. Hoy en día se encuentran los indios en condiciones más duras y peor tratados por gente injusta y cruel que en otro tiempo los judíos, cuando estuvieron cautivos en Egipto […] 15-16. Pero los indios casi en el mismo plazo de tiempo han sido arrasados y exterminados en su mayor parte, de suerte que pueden decir a Dios lo que se lee en el libro de Daniel (3[37]) refiriéndose a los judíos: *Señor hemos disminuido más que todas las naciones, hoy estamos humillados en toda la tierra* […] 41. Dios aparte de nosotros esta desgracia y, compadecido de la causa y de la suerte tanto de españoles como de indios, ayude y dé unidad a ambas repúblicas y las conserve en su santa fé y religión, libres de pecados, injusticias y escándalos […].[11]

As one can see, the living conditions of the indigenous people were tough. They were subjected to different modalities of serfdom, including mistreatment, injustice, and cruelties. These painful conditions allow the comparison with Jewish people, especially regarding forced labor in quarries and silver and mercury mines in Potosí (Bolivia) and Huancavelica (Peru). Furthermore, other labors were also considered compulsory, and public utility and indigenous people should perform them in houses, farms, churches, markets, roads, and the construction of public and private buildings.

A principal modality of serfdom in the colonial Potosí was in the silver mines. There, mines were extracted from the mountain *Cerro rico*, a mythical place, *Achachila*, for indigenous people where minerals are attached to stones, where the mine's interior is difficult to access. In the depths of *Cerro Rico*, scarce light gives a simple outline of the bodies that circulate inside. The infra world of the mountain is dark and cold, with a shortage of air, and filled with clouds and demons taking care of the *Supay,* the god of minerals according to miners from different periods. Working conditions in mines were asphyxiating for indigenous servants, who died soon in a few years from tuberculosis.

Solorzano Pereira often visited the mines in Huancavelica and Potosí while working as a visiting judge from 1616 to 1619.[12] Like other

[11] Solórzano, *De Indiarum Iure*, III, 475-485.

[12] A. Muñoz, *Introducción, textos y traducción del Thesaurus Indicus (1668) de*

intellectuals of his time, he used strong words to refer to the modality of indigenous mining serfdom, categorized in shifts: the daily and warmer *Punchaorunas*, and the nocturne and cold *Tutarunas*. These shifts were taken from Tuesday to Sunday[13] in colonial mining centers. Besides Solorzano Pereira, Diego de Avendaño, Jose da Acosta, and Juan de Matienzo also reported horrifying situations and the misery experienced by indigenous workmen, condemned by Spaniards' greed for silver. This condition led to a modality of extreme serfdom of the body. Here are two moving accounts of this world:

> […] clima y sitio desabrido y estéril, con olores y exhalaciones intolerables, aire pestilente y escaso, a la sola luz de velas cuyos humos ocasionaban grandes trabajos; viendo hasta fantasmas de los mismos demonios subterráneos; teniendo que trepar por escalas dificultosas y mal seguras, peligrosas aun sin carga, con una muerte segura si se llegara a caer de ellas; y como el polvo ocasionaba la enfermedad que llamaban "el mal de la mina", a consecuencia del cual pocos sobrevivían más de cuatro años.[14]

and:

> Trabajan allá dentro, donde es perpetua oscuridad, sin saber poco ni mucho cuando es día. Ni cuando es noche. Y como son lugares que nunca los visita el sol, no sólo hay perpetuas tinieblas, mas también mucho frio, y un aire muy grueso y ajeno a la naturaleza humana; y así sucede marearse los que allá entran de nuevo, como a mí me acaeció, vascas y congoja de estómago.[15]

Erudite metaphors and detailed descriptions of the infra world of the mines show souls haunting the veins of extraction to trade minerals for money, leaves of coca, and food to support miners and their families. Indigenous people had been working in mines since the Incans and the Tiwanakotas. However, during Spanish domination, the mode of production *mitayo* was based on compulsory serfdom, including physical and moral sacrifices. On the other hand, Spaniards claimed that it was voluntary and paid labor despite being forced. It is well known that indigenous people never earned enough to live with dignity.

Diego de Avendaño (Colección del Pensamiento Medieval y Renacentista 16), Pamplona 2001, 130.

[13] Muñoz, *Introducción, textos y traducción*, 131.

[14] J. Solórzano, *Política Indiana - Libro II,* 21, quoted by Muñoz, *Introducción, textos y traducción*, 130.

[15] J. Acosta, *Historia natural y moral de las indias*, Madrid 1979, 99.

One of the most remarkable working modalities during the colonial period in Potosí was the labor in the silver mines. Solorzano was deeply moved as revealed in his stories in *Política Indiana* and in *De Indiarum Iure* about the suffocating scenarios in the underground metal galleries. Places that not only make one lose the senses of day and night, but also the body figures and shadows of workers – many of them indistinguishable and lost amongst the demons and entities of Pluto that very likely inhabit the underworld of the earth.

Solorzano's creative capacity and his sensitivity to write and describe the details of life in the West Indies led him to outline in his second volume's manuscript distinguishable over-human or subhuman situations that the indigenous vassals were suffering in Potosí, Charcas, Cusco and Lima. The Charcas conciliator considered as unacceptable the maintenance of the terrible condition of non-voluntary serfdom in which the indigenous people were dragged, as well as the lack of effective response from the institutions in America to curb the abuses in spite of the existence of royal decrees that promoted the freedom of native Americans.

Solorzano made use of his sharp and heavy pen, as he was recognized as a notable conciliator and advisor to the West Indies. He believed that with his argumentative reasoning he could make some changes happen in a contingent and unpredictable future, and maybe establish the dream of a mixed republic of Europeans and indigenous people in the new world. The audacity of his reasoning cost him dearly, since both he and his son[16] had to join forces to defend the ideas of *De Indiarum Iure* of temporary prohibitions and censorship, portrayed in a legal process against the conciliator of Charcas in Madrid.

Finally, Solorzano, in the last chapter of the last book printed *De Indiarum Iure*, opens the possibility that labor modalities of *Mita* and *Yanaconazgos* should be, in certain moments, considered a public utility, depending on the situational economic contingencies of the empire. These two modalities would limit physical and moral abuses against

[16] For biographical information about Solórzano, see C. Sánchez, *El pensamiento jurídico político de Juan de Solórzano Pereira,* Navarra 2010, 53-70. Furthermore, A. Orías, "Presencia de la escolástica en la historia de las ideas políticas hispanoamericanas. Charcas como centro de reflexión moral sobre el Estado (siglos XVI y XVII)", in *Revista Classica Boliviana*, 12 (2023), 273. Available at https://ojs.umsa.bo/ojs/index.php/classica/article/view/258/542

indigenous people, and they would enhance the necessity of just payment to the indigenous workers facing precarious conditions similar to enslaving.

V. Conclusion

The present research intended to show a new approach to understanding contingent futures by addressing the freedom of thought and publication of probable opinions of a neo-scholastic philosopher, who lived and wrote for two decades in Hispanic America. In the text, arguments in favor and against the censorship of the second volume of the *De Indiarum Iure* were placed in dispute, presented and contradicted by the advisors and censors of the Spanish crown and by our author, the prominent conciliator of Charcas. The latter, being in the place, saw, experienced and decided to write about the continuous abuses and excesses to which the indigenous people were subject to in different working activities on daily basis. Vassals of various kinds, those involuntary servants who exchanged their labor power for wages of poverty and whose conditions were denounced by Solorzano Pereira, Acosta, Avendaño, Friar Domingo of Saint Tomas (Bishop of Charcas), among many others. Furthermore, Solorzano's reflections opened up the possibility for us to think about possible worlds in times where censorship seeks to disguise its power, demanding to soften, moderate, withdraw and extinguish supposed excesses of freedom of thought in favor of the wisdom of the reason of state. Nevertheless, free thinking can frequently be outlined through metaphors, philosophical and literary allegories in contingent futures and can open new possible worlds of broad, critical and free reflection – which are the necessary condiments to investigate science itself with study of different states of affairs.

Universidade de Brasília

Prophecy: A Debate across Cultures:
Jewish, Islamic, and Latin